LABOR POWER

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST UNION PARTY

Volume 1 | MARCH, 1940 | Number 10

LEWIS BREAKS WITH THE NEW DEAL

SOCIAL EFFECTS OF THE WAGES AND HOURS ACT

A.F.L. COUNCIL ENDORSES REPUBLICAN PANACEA

C.I.O. "ORGANIZES" CONSTRUCTION BOSSES

STALINIST UNION WRECKERS AT WORK

WORKERS' CORRESPONDENCE

Published by the Socialist Union Party,
1301 Boston Road, New York, N. Y.

PRICE 5 CENTS

ANNOUNCING NEW LEAFLET

We have received a number of favorable comments on the editorial appearing in our last issue, "Trust Busting or Union Busting?" which exposes the New Deal campaign against labor organizations.

To insure a wider circulation for this timely subject matter it has been printed in leaflet form.

In view of the fact that the New Deal's campaign against labor is increasing in intensity, our readers are urged to give this leaflet the widest possible distribution. This leaflet is especially appropriate for distribution at unions and union meetings.

Rates are $1.00 per thousand or 10c per 100 plus postage. Order a supply immediately.

BRANCH NEW YORK

Branch activities for New York in February were highlighted by two debates held during the course of the month.

The first debate was held on February 4th on the subject, "Socialism versus Atheistic Individualism." Comrade Herbert Brandon represented the Party while Woolsey Teller, well-known anti-Socialist Atheist, representing the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism, upheld the position of capitalist individualism.

Comrade Brandon delivered an able presentation delivering a withering indictment of capitalist individualism and its ripe fruit of chronic unemployment, growing poverty and general insecurity for the workers.

Mr. Teller held forth on the blessings of capitalist individualism and in the course of his presentation managed, Rip Van Winkle-like, to repeat all the stale, warmed-over objections and fabrications which have been the stock in trade for, lo, these many years of the professional Socialist killers.

As Comrade Brandon pointed out in his refutation, listening to Teller's beatification of capitalism one would never believe that we had been "enjoying" a chronic capitalist depression for the past decade and that America was tottering on the brink of a raging holocaust, which, before it runs its course threatens to engulf humanity in social chaos and Barbarism.

Only Socialism, concluded Comrade Brandon, and the program of Socialist Industrial Unionism, can save the American working class from the cruel fate of Fascist enslavement.

An interesting and stimulating question and discussion period followed the debate.

The second debate was held on Sunday evening, February 18th. The subject was the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat." Comrade Abraham Ziegler represented the Party and Jules Bertman of the Revolutionary Workers League, U. S., upheld the Leninist position on Proletarian Dictatorship.

This debate was a repitition in practically all respects of the Minneapolis debate on the same subject betwen Comrade Ziegler and Carlos Hudson of the Trotskyite Socialist Workers Party, which was reported in detail in the December issue of LABOR POWER.

The occasion served to demonstrate anew the bankruptcy of Leninism and the necessity for Socialist Industrial Unionism as the only road to Socialism in the United States.

A number of comrades have volunteered for Forum work and it is planned with the coming of warmer weather to carry on a widespread and systematic distribution of Party literature at union meetings and other workers gatherings.

The Branch has arranged a theatre party to be held Friday evening, March 16th to supplement the sadly depleted Headquarters Funds. The comrades are busily engaged selling tickets and it is hoped to derive a substantial sum from this source.

(*Continued on page* 6)

LABOR POWER

Published Monthly by the
SOCIALIST UNION PARTY
1301 Boston Road
NEW YORK, N. Y.

Subscription: — Per Year, 50c; Semi-Annually, 25c; Single Copy, 5c.

Composed & Printed by Voluntary Labor

Vol. 1, No. 10 March, 1940

Editorials . . .

LEWIS BREAKS WITH THE NEW DEAL

THE GOLDEN JUBILEE convention of the United Mine Workers of America, which was held in Columbus, Ohio, the last week in January, provided the setting for a dramatic and unexpected political turn on the part of the most powerful figure in the ranks of organized labor today. In a scathing indictment of Roosevelt and his New Deal, John L. Lewis made an open and public break with the present Administration.

Lewis' criticisms of the New Deal were of two kinds. First, dealing with administrative weaknesses, he charged the President with having failed to solve the unemployment problem; with not enforcing the Wagner Labor Relations Act in many instances where the U. S. government did business with non-complying corporations; and with having failed to solve the capitalist economic crisis. Secondly, dealing with political questions, Lewis charged Roosevelt with having "broken faith" with the C.I.O. after it had practically guaranteed his election by supporting his campaign both financially and actively on the political field and with not putting a stop to labor-baiting by his fellow Democrats in Congress.

Much can be gained from a critical analysis of John L. Lewis' sudden political turn. For despite the fact that he is undoubtedly what is commonly termed a capitalist labor lieutenant; despite the fact that he has crushed rank and file democracy in his own U.M.W.A. and has just as long a history of working class betrayals and is just as guilty of blocking labor unity as is the infamous officialdom of the A.F.L.;—despite all of his crimes both past and present, Lewis nevertheless reflects the present political consciousness or, rather, backwardness of the working class. It is only because of this backwardness that he continues to retain his high position in the labor movement. Hence, when we put to the test Lewis' charges against the Roosevelt Administration, we are really examining the reactions of a major section of the working class which is beginning to feel disappointment in the failures and growing betrayals of a New Deal which they first greeted with great hopes and expectations.

Lewis' indictment of the New Deal on the grounds of its having "broken faith" with labor is symptomatic of the fact that he suffers from a delusion widely prevalent among the workers: a belief that the present capitalist government can serve their interests and that capitalist politicians whose hearts are in the right place can better their condition. The details of the indictment bear out the delusion. Lewis begins by admitting that labor supported the Democratic Party in 1932 "not because of the virtues of the party; nor the talents nor policy of its leaders." Rather, "it was an act of a despairing population . . . , a population sickened by the moral and intellectual bankruptcy of the Republican Party." Continuing to build up his case against Roosevelt for having "broken faith," Lewis recounts that again "in 1936, a coalition was effected between the Democratic Party and organized labor." Here, interestingly, Lewis relates that among the dummy organizations set on foot by the C.I.O. as part of its campaign to return the Democrats to power were Labor's Non-Partisan League and the American Labor Party, thus officially confirming the Socialist Union Party's oft-stated contention that these organizations are decoys set up to capture working class votes for the New Deal Democratic poli-

ticians. Having established the fact that the C.I.O. contributed mightily towards returning Roosevelt to power, Lewis bitterly complains that "A political coalition, at least, presupposes a post-election good faith between the coalescent interests."

But, from Lewis' further remarks, we are given to understand that his political "innocence" went even further than expecting capitalist politicians to "keep faith" with labor. In tones expressive of his outraged feelings Lewis complains that "labor" was not given representation in the capitalist cabinet, and in "the administrative and policy-making agencies of government." Furthermore, he informed his sympathetic audience that the "current Administration" of the bosses government did not seek or entertain "the advice or views of labor upon the questions of national unemployment . . . , internal taxation, foreign trade, military and naval expansion, relations with foreign nations or the issues of war and peace." The audacity, or perhaps, superb innocence, of a representative of a wage slave class expecting the representatives of the ruling master class to call upon him for advice in matters which concern their most vital interests!

In sharply indicting President Roosevelt and his Secretary of Labor, Mrs. Perkins, for not having done anything to solve the major problem of unemployment, Lewis gives evidence of a naive belief on his part that it is within the power of capitalist politicians to do away with this modern scourge. Lewis asks, rhetorically, why Roosevelt did not respond to his request to call a conference "of labor, industry, agriculture and government" to solve the nation's "No. 1 economic problem." No doubt F. D. R., a little wiser than Lewis in these matters, is aware that no mere conferences can liquidate the effects of a dying profit system. Lewis bitterly recalls that when two years ago he requested him to call such a conference, the President remarked, "Very interesting; send me a memorandum." "We sent him a memorandum," said Lewis, "and that's all on that subject to the present day."

Lewis assumes his full stature as a capitalist labor lieutenant in his discussion of the failure of the Roosevelt regime to solve the unemployment problem. He goes so far as to warn the Democratic politicians that unless they do solve it, the nation's "institutions" will not endure. Instead of looking at the question from the viewpoint of the working class and pointing out that unless the workers organize to overthrow the political state and abolish the private ownership of the means of production,—capitalist institutions!— and establish their own government they will never rid themselves of the horrors of unemployment, poverty, war and fascism, Lewis turns about face and proceeds to warn the capitalists that their "institutions" are in danger!

Coming to grips with the New Deal on the question of war, Lewis continues in the same vein. His indictment of Roosevelt's State Department for its lack of a program to meet the menace of involvement in the new bloodbath again betrays his delusion that capitalist politicians can control the evil effects of their system. Only incidentally does he "warn" the workers to beware of those politicians who believe "that they could solve unemployment by dragging the United States into war." His main argument on the subject is again made from a capitalist point of view, completely betraying working class interests! Commenting on the fact that nearly 70,000,000 men in Europe and Asia are engaged in producing war supplies, Lewis expresses his fears that "when these men are returned to the pursuits of peace the effect upon our nation's remaining foreign trade will be devastating." In another part of his indictment he takes the New Dealers to task because they have no "solution for the question of restricted foreign markets."

Not a word about the fact that the war which now engages the workers of Europe in mutual slaughter is an imperialist war, *fought for foreign markets!* Not a word about the fact that such a war is fought in the interest of the capitalist ruling classes in the rival imperialist countries; and that the workers are being used as cannon fodder. Not a word about the fact that the U.S.A. is even now preparing to enter

that war if necessary, in order to defend its commercial and financial interests in Asia, South America and Europe; not a word about Roosevelt's M Day Plan which calls for the regimentation of all unions under government control the day U. S. capitalism enters the war! No, content to ignore all these very pertinent facts which affect the relationship of the working class to the present war, "labor leader" Lewis has the temerity to call the New Dealers to task—because they have no "solution for the question of restricted foreign markets."

The only other questions upon which he criticizes the Roosevelt regime are "the unrestrained baiting and defaming of labor by the Democratic majority . . . , never subject to rebuke by the titular or actual leaders of the party;" and, finally, the failure of the New Deal to enforce the Wagner Labor Relations Act with respect to government contracts. Again Lewis displays his innocence (?) in expecting the capitalist government, the very agent of the corporations, to act in the interest of the working class. With the law enforcing agencies in the hands of their politician-agents, the capitalists can always either completely nullify or pervert any so-called labor legislation. Lewis, of all people, should know that workers can depend only upon their own economic organization for the "enforcement," even to a limited extent, of such legislation.

At first blush it appears strange that Lewis could find no more points in his indictment of the New Deal in order to bolster up his attack. He appears to be very chary of saying too much and restrains himself to vague generalities. He completely ignored the drastic relief cuts, the extensive lay-offs of W.P.A. workers, the voiding of the prevailing wage principle on W.P.A. jobs, the frame-up of militant Minneapolis W.P.A. strikers by F. D. R.'s ex-Attorney General Murphy, the application of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act to labor unions by F. D. R.'s appointee Thurman Arnold, and the growing rapprochement between the New Deal and big business.

Lewis had his reason for soft-pedaling his case against the Democratic Party. It seems that in spite of all his sad experiences with the bad New Dealers who did not "keep faith" with labor he has not learned his lesson. In the same speech which contained his indictment of the present regime, Lewis held forth a promise of his support to the Democratic Party in the coming campaign! To be sure, he named a price. He demanded an "intelligent and rational program" and "guarantees of good faith by responsible Democratic leaders." And Lewis' white hope No 2 is Democratic Senator Wheeler, who was invited to speak at the jubilee convention.

"Reward your friends and punish your enemies:" that is the reactionary maxim which guides John L. Lewis in his politics. It has been the slogan under which A.F.L. labor fakers have betrayed the working class ever since it was first pronounced by the infamous Samuel Gompers. But if the Lewises never learn, it is high time that the workers begin to take stock of their most recent experience with capitalist

The workers must break, not only with Roosevelt's phony New Deal, but with all capitalist parties. Not only the New Deal but every old deal since the Civil War, has "broken faith" with the workers whose votes put it into office. That is natural under a capitalist form of government. Today, the industries, factories, railroads, all the means of production, belong to the capitalist class. They use their ownership of these necessary tools to exploit the workers and keep them in wage slavery. The government is their government since the very basis upon which it rests is private property. Hence all politicians who are elected to office must of necessity "break faith" with the workers. Hence their total inability to solve the problems arising from capitalism. The politicians can only try to make capitalism run the way it is organized to run—in the interests of the capitalists. To expect them to make it run for the workers, no matter how well-meaning their intentions, is to expect the impossible.

No capitalist party can stop war, unemployment and Fascism, because these are conditions which arise from their system.

Capitalism is rotten with decay, and it will continue to breed misery and destitution for the broad masses of the population until the working class puts an end to it and establishes a new system under which the workers will own the means of production and will enjoy the abundance which they produce. Only a revolutionary workers' party, backed up by the might of the workers organized into one Socialist Industrial Union can or will do that job.

John L. Lewis, by his continued support of the Democratic Party, shows his colors as a capitalist labor lieutenant, but, in his disavowal of the New Deal and his even mild indictment of its failures and crimes he reflects the state of mind of the working class, a working class which is beginning to stir, to sense that all is not right with the "well-meaning" political reformers they sent to Washington.

Working class education is the crying need of the hour. A first step in that direction is for workers to fight for democracy and rank and file control in the unions where it does not exist, so that freest discussion and debate may take place in these "schools of the working class." Another step is for workers to support, join and build the Socialist Union Party, and make it a real beacon light of education and organization for Socialism.

—F. PIERSON

ORGANIZATION NOTES

(*Continued from page* 2)

BRANCH LOS ANGELES

Encouraging reports continue to be received from Comrade William Briggs, National Organizer, on the job in Los Angeles.

Comrade Briggs reports that the Forum is continuing to hold regular weekly meetings despite unfavorable weather conditions that have been encountered. Among recent speakers have been Comrade O C. Robineau, Organizer of the Branch. He spoke on "Seeds of Destruction;" M. Downing who spoke on "The State, Its Origin and Role" and Earl Parrott whose topic was "Crime, Criminals and the Remedy."

Branch Los Angeles has a very active forum committee which is giving an excellent account of itself. Recently the Branch covered a large mass meeting of the left wing New Deal Democrats which was called around the relief issue, with a specially prepared leaflet on the Relief Crisis, giving the Party position. The leaflet, although hurriedly drawn up, was written in concise, clear cut terms and was favorably received by the workers.

Recently Comrade Briggs and another comrade drove down to Long Beach and put in some fine licks of S.U.P. propaganda. Comrade Briggs addressed an audience of workers at the pier and at the conclusion of his talk sold 30 copies of LABOR POWER. Many more could have been disposed of but that was all that were on hand.

The comrades are planning to return to Long Beach again soon.

Daniel De Leon

"The only man who has added anything to Socialist theory since Marx and Engels."

—*N. Lenin.*

All workers owe it to themselves to become acquainted with the works of one who is universally conceded to be America's foremost revolutionist and Marxian theoretician. Knowledge is power!

We recommend:—

Reform and Revolution 5c
What Means This Strike? 5c
Socialist Reconstruction of Society 10c
Burning Question of Trades Unionism 10c

The following pamphlets, containing the De Leonist position on their respective questions, will be published soon:—

Socialism or Dictatorship? 5c
War and the Working Class 5c
Fascism or Socialism? 5c

Send all orders to: P.O. Box No. 4, Station T, New York, N. Y.

A.F.L. COUNCIL ENDORSES REPUBLICAN PANACEA

WORKERS whose evening recreation after a hard day's work consists of sitting in front of the radio and trying to answer the questions propounded on the various "Quiz" programs, can take a little time off to guess the author of the following brilliant passage:

"At this time there are not enough jobs in private industry to go round. This is largely due, in our opinion, to the fact that lack of confidence has stunted business growth and expansion. We demand that those in authority take whatever steps may be necessary to restore business confidence.

"We urge that all government actions that tend unnecessarily to discourage business expansion cease and that a positive effort be made to encourage greater industrial activity. We have learned the lesson that when opportunities for profit diminish, opportunities for jobs likewise disappear."

No, the above is not an extract from the latest press release of the National Association of Manufacturers or the United States Chamber of Commerce. Neither is it an editorial excerpt from the *Wall Street Journal* or the *New York Herald Tribune*. Quite the contrary; this precious pearl of wisdom emanates from a group which has the effrontery to speak in the name of labor—the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor. Meeting at Miami for its annual midwinter session, these "labor leaders" proceeded to adopt the program of the Republican Party, spokesmen for top capitalism, for their own. Thus once more do these charlatans expose their true character as agents of the capitalist class within the ranks of the workers, spreading the false gospel of humbug capitalist economics.

Top capitalism, through its politicians, its newspapers, and now its labor faker tools, has hit on the happy formula of capitalizing on the failure of the New Deal to solve the pressing problem of chronic unemployment by attributing this failure to the anti-business policies of the Administration, to its "ruinous" interference with private initiative, and to its excessive and punitive tax legislation on business. Cut the shackles restraining business, they cry, supplant the New Deal with a pro-business administration, then American industry will lead the country into a golden era of prosperity in which the vexing problem of unemployment will melt like snow before the spring sun.

This sentiment was re-echoed ina recent address before the Michigan Manufacturers Association by Henry du Pont, Vice-President of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., one of the world's largest capitalist enterprises. Mr. du Pont pleaded for a "fair" system of taxation and a set of rules framed to encourage industry. He promised that:

" . . . then capital will soon come out of hiding so that industry may resume the growth it has shown it is capable of through past performance. Merely to regain and maintain the old standard of living reached during the 1920s, as measured by per capita production and consumption, would necessitate the operation of our factories and mines during the next ten years at an average rate of activity far higher than we have ever known."

Mr. du Pont declared that if the changes desired by business were effected, jobs would be created for every able-bodied man and instead of chronic unemployment there would be a chronic labor shortage.

This is a beautiful mirage and an extremely attractive one to growing numbers of unemployed who have become disillusioned with the New Deal, which has proven bankrupt. But those workers who attempt to get out of the Roosevelt frying pan by jumping once more into the fire of Hooverism will find that they have only altered the method by which they are burned. For, despite the fine phrases of Mr. du Pont and the editorial spokesmen for big business, they are not concerned with relieving the distress of the unem-

ployed. Their real grievance against the New Deal lies in the fact that it has hit them hard in their tenderest spot, the pocketbook.

The working class and capitalism stand in opposition to each other, because capital cannot prosper, except at the expense of the workers; nor can the workers increase their living standards without cutting into the profits of the employers. Therefore, there is no reason for labor to make common cause with the reactionary industrial and financial interests in their fight against the Roosevelt Administration. But that is precisely what the "labor leaders" of the Executive Council of the A.F.L. are doing. They are aiding the exploiters of labor to throw dust in the eyes of the workers which blinds them to the real cause of chronic unemployment and increasing misery—the capitalist system itself. Why? Because if the workers understand what causes their miserable condition, they will act to do away with that cause and in the act of abolishing capitalism they will overthrow the false leaders and labor betrayers along with the private ownership of industry.

In releasing the pro-capitalist blurb quoted above, the A.F.L. leaders showed their customary contempt for the intelligence and memories of their membership. Apparently they believe that the rank and file has forgotten that chronic unemployment was not brought into being by the New Deal, but that it was inherited from Hoover, under whose beneficent aegis more than 17 millions were unemployed at the bottom of the crisis.

In 1933, the top capitalists, who today are so vociferously condemning Roosevelt for interfering with business, were only too glad to accept that same intervention as the only means of averting a complete collapse of their system.

What had caused that collapse? Certainly, not obnoxious government interference with business! For there had been none since 1920, at the latest. For a period of twelve years the safe and sane Republican Party had been in undisturbed possession of the national government and its machinery. The relationship between government and business had been one of the most complete harmony. As for taxation, with Andrew Mellon and Ogden Mills on guard in the Treasury Department, capital had the "fair" system of taxation which Mr. Henry du Pont so ardently desires to see again. In all those twelve years there was not a single piece of legislation passed by Congress which could be pointed to as being even remotely unfriendly to private enterprise. In short, from 1920 to 1932 Industry and Finance, through the benign instrument of the Republican Party, were the actual wielders of power.

And what was the outcome of this ideal, common-sense, businesslike administration, free from all the vices which characterize the New Deal? Every child knows the answer to that one—the greatest panic and crisis in the history of the country; an army of unemployed reaching to 17 million workers in 1932; a "depression" which is still with us despite all of Roosevelt's shots in the arm in the shape of government spending to the extent of billions of dollars!

Yet today, with the history of the present crisis an open record remembered by nearly everybody, the apologists for top capitalism and their labor stooges have the audacity to offer as a remedy the return of the same conditions out of which the original evil sprang! And this passes for economic science and political acumen in the camp of capitalism! Truly do the capitalists and their hirelings have a deep and abiding contempt for the understanding of their slaves!

Let us get one thing clear. The New Deal thesis that the present crisis is the creation of the Republican Party is no less nonsensical than their opponent's lament that chronic unemployment is a New Deal product. Unemployment and its attendant miseries are inescapable by-products of the operation of the capitalist system of production, and will remain with us no matter which set of politicians has control of the government machinery.

The realities of capitalist production—

the necessity of counteracting the tendency of the rate of profit to fall, the need to meet and ward off competition, both domestic and foreign—compel capitalism to strive constantly to reduce its productive costs. This means an ever-increasing displacement of labor by machinery and improved technology. Those workers who remain at work are subjected to all sorts of inhuman speed-up systems which reduce the total number of workers employed by increasing the rate of production per worker. Thus capitalism can continue to exist only by progressively reducing employment and constantly encroaching on the living standards of the working class.

No amount of capitalist sophistry can explain away this A-B-C of scientific political economy. The tempting picture, painted by the du Ponts and their ilk, of a golden era of prosperity in which unemployment will be wiped out and the workers provided with undreamed-of comforts is just another capitalist pipe dream.

The only solution for the chronic social ailment of unemployment lies in the abolition of capitalist production. Until the workers accept and act in accordance with this prognosis, their fate will continue to be increasing misery, insecurity and degradation.

As one of the first steps in the process of proletarian emancipation the workers must expose, repudiate and eliminate the servants of their capitalist exploiters, the labor fakers, from their ranks. As long as the organizations of labor continue to remain under the control and domination of such traitors, the strength and vitality of the working class will be run into the ground and labor's struggles will be fruitless.

SOCIAL EFFECTS OF THE WAGES AND HOURS ACT

The Wages and Hours Act, establishing minimum wage rates and maximum hours for workers employed in industries or occupations whose products enter into interstate commerce, has been widely hailed by the supporters of the Roosevelt Administration as one of the major social achievements of the New Deal. Under its provisions the standard of wages and working conditions has been raised for thousands of workers in sweatshops and sub-standard factories and industries, particularly in the South, where workers had previously been accustomed to work for wages as low as $5 and $6 for 44 hours of work per week.

Going into effect in October, 1938, the Act established a general wage of 25 cents per hour and a maximum work week of 44 hours, beyond which the employer was obliged to pay at the rate of time and a half. The Administrator appointed by the President was empowered to establish higher minimum wages or lower maximum hours in particular industries, after investigating prevailing standards in such industries. In October, 1939, the general minimum wage was raised to 30 cents per hour and the maximum hours cut to 42; in October, 1940, there will be a further change to 35 cents per hour for 40 hours, and the final change under the provisions of the law will establish a minimum wage of 40 cents per hour for 40 hours in October, 1941.

Taken at face value, this law appears to be as far-reaching and beneficial a piece of legislation as were any of the Factory Acts passed by Parliament in the middle of the last centry to abolish the horrible conditions existng in British industry. Yet, because capitalism today is no longer progressive or expanding, the real social effect of the Wages and Hours Law will be detrimental rather than helpful to the workers whom it was designed to aid. As a result of the application of this law it will be found that while less and less workers will complain of working long hours for little wages, more and more workers will complain of not working at all!! In other words, the effect of this law, no matter what the intentions of its fram-

ers, will be to give impetus to the construction of labor-displacing machinery and the installation of intensified speed-up and stretch-out systems in the industries affected. As a consequence, the ranks of the permanent army of unemployed must rise.

As an illustration of how laws of this type are received by the capitalist class which has to pay the bill, we cite the following letter which appeared in the correspondence columns of the *New York Times* on March 6th, 1939:

"According to a news report, Elmer Andrews, administrator of the Wages and Hours Act, announced a hearing upon the desirability of amending the act to exempt white-collar workers receiving above some specified salary. It is reported that this hearing may not be held because industrialists have not 'registered sufficient demand for the proposed change . . .

"As an officer in several industrial concerns, I can say that we made no protest to Washington, but steps are being taken to use bookkeeping machines and accounting machines which will gradually reduce the number of white-collar workers. This is only another example of how the efforts to improve the workers' conditions for the sake of vote-gathering are resulting in disaster to the intended beneficiaries, because higher cost of labor enforces use of labor-saving equipment, even in the office."

"Industrialist."

Thus we see that so far as our capitalists are concerned, they do not intend to take social legislation of this kind without resistance in one form or another. As to those workers who were so unfortunate as to be eliminated from their jobs by means of the new labor-saving devices installed, the improvements established by the law are indeed only a mockery. In the present state of the labor market their chances of regaining work are extremely slim.

The effects of the widespread movement for increased mechanization and rationalization are being felt by workers everywhere. For example, the December 15, 1939 issue of the *North Shore Organizer* has the following report from a worker correspondent in the Peabody-Salem Textile plant:

"The Bleachery has become an 'experimental laboratory' for every new machine that comes on the market. 'Kindergarten Technocrats' Al Tanguay insists on calling them. The biggest headache is in the stitching room, where many workers are being displaced."

This report can be duplicated in almost every issue of any labor paper. Side by side with whatever improvements the Wages and Hours Act may effect for the lowest strata of workers, there goes on an increasing displacement of large numbers of workers. And this displacement takes place not only in the industries directly affected by the Act. The decrease in employment in those industries reduces the number of potential consumers, or buyers, of all products, which in turn means reduced demand, less production and increased unemployment, even in industries not directly covered by the Act. Thus the attempt to better workers' conditions without removing the capitalist system only results in a vicious circle in which the workers find themselves worse off than before!

The correspondent of the *North Shore Organizer,* quoted above, concludes his report by suggesting that the shorter work week is the way out of this dilemma. He is quite mistaken, however. The fact of the matter is that within the last decade the textile industry, as well as industry in general, has witnessed a drastic reduction in its weekly hours of labor. Whereas in 1929 the work week was in excess of 54 hours, the average today has been brought down to 44. Despite this 20 per cent. cut in the average working time, there has been little change in the upward trend of unemployment due to the introduction of new machinery.

In point of fact, it is this very reduction of working hours that served to spur on the capitalists to the technological advances which have cost thousands their jobs Should the current agitation for a thirty-hour week, the current panacea for unemployment, show any prospects of achievement, it would only set in motion another movement for technological improvement

which would in the long run only aggravate and intensify the basic question of unemployment facing the workers.

Once again we reiterate what the Socialist movement has been saying and proving for lo these many years: there is no solution for the problem of increasing unemployment within the framework of capitalist production. This does not mean, however, that workers should give up their attempts through their unions to ameliorate their conditions under capitalism by means of struggle for wage increases, lower hours and improved working standards. In view of the increasing intensification of the labor process and the mounting nervous and physical strains which accompany it, a shorter work day and a brake upon the speed-up designs of the employers are absolute physical and social necessities for the workers. If the workers are not to be reduced to the condition of broken wretches past salvation,' they must vigorously contest every encroachment by their capitalist exploiters.

Nevertheless, it must be clearly understood that these efforts at amelioration can not solve the problem of unemployment, nor can they do more than slow down the constant encroachments by capitalism. At best such struggles can only afford temporary relief and the effort to make them serve as "cure-all" can only result in disaster.

As long as the capitalist system, based on production for profit and private ownership of the socially used means of production is permitted to exist the capitalist class will continue to displace labor by improved machines and improved technique. But to state the problem thus is to suggest the only possible answer: Take the ownership and control of the machine and its products from the capitalist class and place them in the hands of society!

Not the false nostrum of social reform legislation but the collective ownership and democratic operation of the industries by the useful members of society under the banner of the Industrial Republic of Labor is the way out for the workers. Nothing less will do!

EDUCATION

Education has been seriously confused with training and since the two methods of learning are not the same it is essential to define both in order that they may be intelligently discussed. Training consists of that which we are taught by parents, teachers and empolyers and the purpose is to direct or regulate our thought and action. Education, on the other hand, is that which we ourselves derive from our environment in general and which determine our reaction to new or changed conditions. Thus, the man who finds a way to make a better tool has used his previous education to gain further education. His intelligence is raised to a higher level His education has been advanced since his brain has met a new situation and supplied its own solution.

Education and training may come into conflict with each other and education may defeat the purpose of training or the individual's need for the results of the training may suppress the education. For example, a young man spends three-fourths of his college career in the study of law. This is training. During this period, however, his education has progressed to a point which causes him to detest both the letter and the spirit of that profession. His training and education have become opposed and he faces a serious dilemma. He has spent a great deal of time and money in acquiring training which is now brought into conflict with the education that has been developed out of his composite reactions to the profession for which he is being trained.

It is thus evident that training and education may be diametrically opposed, and that the principle way in which training may contribute to education is indirectly. Training is a process that teaches the individual how to do certain things and is

important in the gaining of technique. Education is the composite effect of our environment and enables us to meet new conditions, make decisions and discoveries. This brings up the question of different methods of training and their effect upon individual education and collective progress.

The two methods which here oppose each other are blind faith on the one side and scientific information on the other. The student who is trained in the former school uses certain articles of belief as the building stones of his education while the student trained in the scientific school uses the facts of science to build his intellectual edifice. The most interesting thing to note in this connection is the process of evolution that is going on within and between these two opposing methods of instruction. The discoveries of modern science have rendered void and useless a great many of the old building blocks of belief from which the older structure of blind faith was built and these holes have been plugged with sophistry and other inferior material until hardly any of the original stones remain. It is apparent that Humpty-Dumpty is to have company when the old building collapses, since no one can put it together again. There are still parts of the old structure that are inhabited by men and so it must be taken into consideration as an opponent of modern science.

But what are the fundamental discoveries of modern science? First and foremost, modern science has discovered that this is a dynamic universe and that the one certainty is constant change. It has discovered that man belongs to the mammalian division of the animal kingdom and that both man and the animals are a part of this planet having been derived from the chemical elements of which it is composed and conditioned by the forces of their environment in conjunction with the individual and collective reactions to those forces. Man is therefore discovered to be a material creature living in a material environment from which he was originally derived in the shape of a minute unicellular organism.

Science has discovered that factual knowledge can be gained only from experience. Of course, this experience may be vicarious since it is not necessary that every one burn his fingers in order to learn that such is the effect of fire. The implications of experience are also valuable but can never be accepted as scientific knowledge until actually tested. When these few scientific principles are well understood they constitute a means of discerning the pseudo-scientist from the real scientist and knowledge of the difference between them is all-important in these days of cross-currents and confusion in every field of human endeavor.

It should be well understood that those who seek to lead us by means of blind faith or who spout metaphysical terms, such as "patriotism" and other meaningless jargon, are the pseudo-scientists. To them the world is static and men are good or bad according to certain moral codes. They tell us that the condition of man can only be improved by changing human nature and that this change is to be brought about by means of exhortations, prayers and incantations. Modern science replies that in order to change human nature there must necessarily be such fundamental changes made in the organism that the result would either be extinction of the species or a creature with no resemblance to man.

Investigations have demonstrated to modern scientists that changes in man's environment bring corresponding changes in man's mode of living and that changes in his mode of life, that is, in the way he obtains his food, clothing and other necessities, bring about changes in his relations with his fellow men and consequently changes in the nature of every department of his social life. Now, inasmuch as the foremost principle of modern science is constant change in everything that composes our universe, it is apparent that man's present condition is the result of his reactions to all previous changes and that his future condition will be determined by changes in his present environment. Science has discovered that nothing happens in this universe except as the result of a previous condition or cause. It has also discovered that similar conditions produce similar effects and this enables the scientist

to predict approximate results of known conditions. The reverse is also possible, that is, when the desired condition is known the pre-requisite to that condition can be determined.

How can this scientific knowledge affect the lives of those of us who live in the present generation? Let us view the world through the eyes of a modern scientific social economist. We see a large section of the civilized world living under an economic system known as capitalism which carries along with it a parasitical growth called the political state. In some of these various nations the political state functions as a parliamentary government while in others it has become autocratic and upon closer observation the reason for this becomes apparent. This capitalist system has broken down and is no longer able to supply the necessities of life to those who live under it. In some nations it has broken down so completely that its parasite, the political state, has discarded its mask of parliamentarism and is attempting by means of military dictatorship to maintain life in the dying system. In this attempt the political state is aided and abetted by pseudo-scientists who deluge the people with assurances that nothing serious has happened and that soon the system will be functioning again to the best advantage of everyone.

The real scientists know that the dead cannot be resurrected but instead must be buried and they have already discerned the embryo of a new and different economic system within the body of capitalism and they have given it the name of Socialism. "A rose by any other name would be as sweet," however, so we are not particularly interested in the name. We are interested in its basic nature, which has been discovered to be the collective ownership by all the people of the natural resources, machinery of production and means of distribution. The real scientist also sees that democracy can be erected only o nsuch an economic base since collective ownership makes possible a system of self-government which could not be maintained under a system of private ownership. This, for the very evident reason that the people cannot control something which they do not own. Democracy, therefore, must have a socialized economy as its pre-requisite. The pseudo-scientists, however, have always maintained that we have democracy but that it does not work properly because the people do not elect the right men to public office, etc., etc.

It appears to the real scientists that the break-down of the capitalist system presages some basic and far-reaching change that will affect every phase of our economic and social life. There is plenty of historical evidence to show that climatic changes in the past have brought little or no benefits to the large mass of people since they were dominated by ignorance and its hand-maiden, superstition, with the result that they blindly followed their leaders into another wilderness. This is one of the most important lessons that history has to offer and the only way to make certain that the next fundamental social upheaval shall not result in defeat for the majority is the education of that majority. This is no simple or easy achievement. Instead, it is difficult and complex and will require considerable time. What, then, are the pre-requisites to success in the coming crisis wherein the workers (that is, the majority) are to play the leading role?

Before the workers can estabilsh democracy throughout the nation they must establish it within their own organizations. They must take the control of their unions out of the hands of the servants of the capitalist class. They must remove any multiplication of such organizations since one labor union will be many times stronger than several such unions. The responsibility for success must rest equally on every member. This practical education must then be augmented by scientific education in all of the subjects that can throw light upon the nature and history of economic and social evolution.

The capitalist system contains the seeds of its own destruction, but the establishment of a better system to take its place may develop into a long, drawn-out struggle accompanied by much suffering unless the workers understand what has to be done and know how to do it.

—H. B. L.

WORKERS' CORRESPONDENCE

Editor, Labor Power:

The propaganda machine (patented 1917) has been dusted off for use quite soon. True, plenty of propaganda has seasoned the news till now; the articles telling the world how interested Chamberlain and Daladier are in doing away with Nazism, that the Allies are motivated by nothing less than love of democracy, and that it is America's duty to supply guns and ammunition to help murder German workers so that "liberty" and peace may reign. But that type of propaganda is not new. The press has always tried to blur the issues at stake in any conflict, shifting the blame for an evil state of affairs from the shortcomings of capitalism to the wickedness of a few malefactors in high places. Thus, while actually lying about certain events, or distorting the meaning of others, it has apparently and on the surface appealed to reason.

But the propaganda now being distilled by press, pulpit and radio affects the emotions. It is the 1917 horror stories brought up to date. The first edition was launched with official sanction back in December, when President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull announced that they would ask Congress to vote that Finland's debt payments be returned to her in the form of a new loan. Why? Because of the horrible bombardment which Finnish cities have suffered at the hands of brutal Soviet Russia.

Strange! When Ethiopia was being dum-dummed by the invading Fascist armies, American armament manufacturers continued to supply Italy with ammunition and war materials. President Roosevelt was not the least bit shocked into rendering any practical aid to Ethiopia. All during the Spanish Civil War the Arms Embargo, which really embargoed arms only for Loyalist Spain, since Franco was being plentifully supplied by Italy and Germany, was kept in full force. But the self-same embargo was disregarded when it came to the conflict between China and Japan and the aggressor, Japan, was aided in its depderations by guns, munitions and planes supplied by American manufacturers.

So, while the history of the past few years has been replete with the wanton killing and bombing of innocent people in Ethiopia, Spain, China, Albania and Poland, the President has hitherto remained unmoved as far as rendering any aid is concerned. Suddenly Finland is invaded and Helsinki bombed and the State Department's collective heart is touched!

In the first World War the invasion of Belgium by Germany was the spark that set the horror stories going—stories of little children's hands chopped off, of cruel starvation and the old standby, the rape of innocent womanhood. Americans were called upon to stop the Kaiser's march, lest the same crimes be committed against them. Emotional harangues called America to avenge "Bleeding Belgium."

Finland is being dressed up to occupy the same position of martyrdom now. The parallel is almost complete. Like Belgium, Finland was a neutral invaded by an ally of Germany. American capitalism, as in the last war, is lined up on the side of British and French imperialism for the purpose of seeing German capital defeated. The martyr has been found, and the Roosevelt Administration, ably assisted by the capitalist press, is doing the necessary propaganda work to arouse the American people by focusing their attention on the crimes of Stalin and the heroism of the Finns. This is accompanied by details of the terrible sufferings which the invaded people are undergoing as well as long eulogies of their love of democracy, etc.

The next step will seek to identify the hatred aroused against the Soviet Union with love for England and France and then America will be ready for another holy crusade for "democracy." That is, unless the American workers recognize the symptoms beforehand with the truth that governments which manufacture war are not interested in either peace or democracy, and that the only way to achieve both of these objectives is to do away with the system which has given rise to exploitation, misery, war and fascism—capitalism.

CAROLYN SCOTT

C.I.O. "ORGANIZES" CONSTRUCTION BOSSES

In sponsoring the newly-launched United Construction Workers' Organizing Committee last summer, John L. Lewis, CIO Chairman, stressed the importance of organizing the more than two million unorganized building and construction workers, an achievement which would result, he predicted, in improving the wages and working conditions for all the workers in the industry.

In actual practice, however, the UCWOC has been devoting its efforts not to organizing the unorganized workers, but rather to organizing the building contractors on the company union basis of slashing existing wage rates and labor standards.

The ice was broken in Washington, D. C., where the CIO outfit signed an agreement with a contractors' organization which, among other provisions, sets up wage rates 30 per cent. below the prevailing A. F. of L. scale. In New York City the CIO organizers are busily engaged in peddling agreements to the contractors providing, in one case, for wages of $9.00 for eight hours' work, where the A. F. of L. scale calls for $12.00 for six hours.

Not content with holding out the enticing prospect of cheaper wage rates and lowered labor standards, the CIO fakers are also offering the employers the inducement of "increased production" and a "full share of honest labor and cheaper costs." At a recent conference of New York City locals of the UCWCC, a resolution was passed, affirming, among other things, that "we shall not tolerate monopolistic tendencies of any kind or nature within the construction field. . . . We will contribute our full share of honest labor, cheaper costs and better buildings." (*CIO News,* Jan. 15, 1940.)

This kowtowing to the employers comes at the very moment when the entire legal machinery of the federal government is being mobilized to attack the American labor movement in a series of conspiracy prosecutions for alleged monopolistic practices. The CIO leadership is evidently by no means averse to gaining a factional advantage at the expense of the A. F. of L. by giving aid and comfort to the enemies of labor in their campaign to strangle union independence.

The assurance of the CIO organizers that they are prepared to contribute to the bosses a "full share of honest labor and cheaper costs" has a practical significance to building workers even deeper than the company union manner in which it is expressed. The building trades unions have generally been more successful than those in other fields in fighting off the attempts of the employers to institute "speed-up" methods and in counteracting the effects of the introduction of technological improvements and labor-displacing machinery. This has long been a sore point with the contractors, who have bemoaned the "pig-headedness" and "short-sightedness" of the unions, which is "preventing the industry from progressing to higher levels of productivity." That such "progress" would be accompanied by increasing unemployment and economic stress among the building workers, is of course of little concern to the contractors. But heretofore they have been unable to break down the resistance of the unions to all attempts at labor displacement. Where the contractors have failed, the CIO is now attempting to fill the breach!

As might have been expected, the building contractors have welcomed the CIO invasion of the construction industry with open arms and have lent a more than willing ear to the proposals of the UCWOC. The February issue of the official organ of the Building Trades Employers Association of the City of New York, *News and Opinion,* gave its members the following report concerning the organizing

activities of the CIO in the building field:

"Members of the B.T.E.A. engaged in work outside of Manhattan may expect visits from CIO organizers seeking to have them sign agreements of various kinds. Contractors have been so approached in January.

"The contracts offered included a stipulation for check-off of dues and assessments by the employers hiring through the unions and a straight eight-hour day at $9.00 for all skilled workers, the privilege of using the mechanic on any work and freedom from jurisdictional disputes. Shift work is also permitted. The organizers, it was said, showed a willingness to change some clauses objected to by the contractors.

"This is indeed a proposition for employers suffering under a six-hour, $12.00 day and jurisdictional disputes. . . ."

Indeed! Indeed this is some proposition for the employers! But what about the workers? As we always understood it, the union is supposed to make its propositions in favor of the workers!

Perhaps, however, the bosses' press is misrepresenting the attitude of the CIO for its own reasons. Not so, however, for we find the CIO in its own press gloating over the warm welcome its representatives received from the employers in the building industry. Under the headline "Construction Employers Show Interest in CIO," the *CIO News* of February 5, 1940, contains the following Washington item by Cecil Owen:

"Favorable reaction to the CIO drive in the construction industry came this week from a wide variety of sources. Contractors in Pennsylvania and New Jersey called in representatives of the United Construction Workers' Organizing Committee for information and showed keen interest in the CIO program.

"A. D. Lewis, Chairman of the UCWOC, got an enthusiastic reception from more than 300 contractors at a meeting in Elizabeth, N. J. Consensus was that the industrial union form of labor organization is the answer to the industry's greatest problem—jurisdictional disputes among craft unions.

"Typical of comment on the UCWOC program was an editorial that appeared in the *Newark Star Ledger*, a daily newspaper, which read:

"'CIO'S CHALLENGE'

"'A significant challenge to the craft unions of the American Federation of Labor is being made in New Jersey by the CIO in sponsoring an industrial union embracing all crafts in the construction industry.

"'A. D. Lewis, brother of John L. Lewis, is directing the drive and is appealing directly to employers in the building trades, offering them the prospect of lower costs through increased labor productivity and aggressive cooperation in eliminating wastefulness in building operations.

"'The Lewis threat to the building trades unions of the A. F. of L. is not an idle one. There is much dissatisfaction among employers and the public with cumbersome rules and jurisdictional fights that tend to increase the cost of housing. President Roosevelt has given voice to this prevalent dissatisfaction. Now, a brother of John L. Lewis comes along and appeals directly to the employers to be receptive to a CIO movement for the purpose of lowering production costs. The appeal is a strong one.' . . ."

That the UCWOC is receiving an enthusiastic reception from the building contractors is not at all surprising. After all, even the best of company unions can hardly offer more than the

voluntary cooperation and sympathetic understanding that the CIO is tendering the employers.

The activities of the CIO in the construction industry should be of more than passing interest to the rank and file members of the other affiliates of the CIO. Unionism has reached a pretty low state of affairs when an outfit which purports to be a union supposedly acting in the interests of its worker members can boast of its efforts to curry favor with the employers by the company union tactics of undermining labor solidarity.

It may be, perchance, that the rank and file of the CIO are not particularly interested in the "abstract" ethics of labor solidarity; the craft unions of the A. F. of L. never paid much attention to the question either. Nevertheless, the anti-labor antics of the UCWOC involves "practical" considerations for the CIO membership which can not be ignored. Let us illustrate:

It so happens that the United Mine Workers has been conducting a vigorous campaign to establish a six-hour day in that industry. This demand is vital to the interests of the miners. The mine owners have stubbornly resisted the introduction of the six-hour day with the usual capitalist excuse that a shorter work-day is "impractical." But at the very same time when the CIO miners are waging their battle for the establishment of a six-hour day in the mines, the CIO's construction affiliate is endeavoring to scuttle the six-hour day already established in the construction industry!

Let the miners and other CIO members ask themselves—what would be the eventual effect upon their own working conditions if the move to break down the standards in the building field is successful? Once the six-hour day is lost there, will the employers be more likely to grant it in other industries?

Those CIO workers who are interested in maintaining their own union standards so laboriously established, must see to it that the double-dealing anti-labor policies of the leadership in the UCWOC is brought to an end. A continuation of such tactics can only accrue to the benefit of the employers and to the detriment of labor as a whole.

Turning now to the A. F. of L. Building Trades Unions, we find that they, in their turn, are among the most corruptly-led and racket-ridden in the entire American labor movement. They commit their full share of sins against the solidarity of the workers by prohibitive initiation fees and closed union books, which automatically bars the majority of the workers in the construction field from joining the union ranks. Condemnation of the UCWOC, therefore, by no means implies any approval of the anti-labor practices of the A. F. of L. unions.

It is up to the rank and file of the Building Trades' workers in both camps to cease condoning the labor faking and racketeering leadership, and proceed to place their house in order, before the current drive for government regulation of labor unions results in the ultimate emasculation of the labor movement. The agitation for "labor responsibility" last year, the present cries for amendment of the Wagner Act, the Administration attack on labor under cover of the Anti-Trust laws, the abrogation of workers' rights by the Anti-Picketing Referendum passed in Oregon, all these are straws pointing which way the wind is blowing.

Only by labor ceasing its organizational rivalry, cleaning its own house of misleaders, and uniting all its forces by opening its books to the entire working class; only by placing its reliance on independent working class economic and political action in the struggle against the capitalist class, can it hope to maintain its organizational independence and to forge ahead towards its emancipation.

STALINIST UNION WRECKERS AT WORK

IT HAS always been a good policy to scrutinize closely those who shout "Stop, Thief!" And in the field of labor organization it is equally instructive to examine into the motives and deeds of those who shout "Red-Baiter" or "Betrayer" as a reply to legitimate criticism of actions which are inimical to the interests of the workers. Such a study is particularly valuable in those organizations where the Communist Party or its stooges play a leading role in the union administration. As a case in point, let us look into the affairs of the State, County and Municipal Workers of America.

Chartered by the C I O in July, 1937 to undertake the organization of all civil service employees except those in Federal employ, the union has from the very beginning been under the domination of the Communist Party. A comparison of its official utterances, as exemplified by the articles apppearing in the *Civil Service Standard,* organ of District No. 1, with those of the Comunist Party itself will show undeniable parallels. When the C.P. line was "Collective Security," the *Standard,* under the caption "Union Hails President's Peace Stand," quoted a telegram sent by the District Officers in the name of the union's membership, pledging full support to Roosevelt's "efforts to keep America out of war " That was in 1938. One year later, in September, 1939, before the news of the Stalin-Hitler pact could be digested, the *Standard* again was preparing to support a third term for Roosevelt, and in fact printed on Page One a resolution to that effect which the District officers were preparing for the National Convention. When the Convention met, however, the alliance between Stalin and Hitler had already been concluded, the C.P. had reversed its line and so the resolution was never presented and the *Standard* remained strangely silent.

Again, in December of 1938, when the Communist Party policy in New York State was to support the American Labor Party, the minutes of the District Executive Board contained a very intersting report by Secretary-Treasurer Barbara Best who stated that the first month's operation under the new budget set up by the District had run over estimated expenditures by $247, accounted for by the extraordinary disbursement of $500 as the union's contribution to the A.L.P. Eleven months later, however, the District leadership had no compunction in overthrowing the supposed "will of the Membership" to support the A.L.P. when it came out in support of Michael Quill, Stalinist stooge, who had been repudiated by the A.L.P. As a matter of fact, the membership had nothing to say about the matter either time. What is more startling, the membership as a whole is not aware to this day of the donation to the A.L.P. which so seriously drained the union treasury.

All of the acts of the leadersip have been carried out primarily with the object of serving the political interests of the Communist Party and only secondarily to benefit the rank and file. Often the two objectives clashed, and then Stalinism always won out. As an example of how the workers were deceived for the purpose of carrying out the C.P. line, we may cite the refusal of the leadership in 1938 to permit any criticism of Governor Lehman or the Democratic administration in New York State when they revoked the mandatory pay increases due to State civil service workers. The leadership was busily engaged in trying to make the rank and file believe that Gov. Lehman, as the leader of the New Deal forces in New York, was not responsible for thus helping to cheat the workers out of the extra $10 per month due them, but that the trouble lay with "reactionaries" who wanted to scuttle the New Deal.

A year later, at the National Convention, Mayor La Guardia, another suposed friend of the workers, was permitted to address the delegates with a speech which was distinctly anti-union in content and in tone; the Mayor stating, among other things, that no incompetent employee could save himself from dismissal by joining the union. The fact is, as every member of the

union knows, that charges of incompetence are always brought *after* a worker becomes active in the union, in order to get rid of him.

To combat the false policies and the betrayals of the union's interests by the C.P. leadership and the C.P. caucus, a "Progressive Group" was formed. This group, while composed of members of diverse political opinions, found a cohesive force in the one idea of building a strong, democratic union responsible to the rank and file. The members of this group were by no means opposed to the idea that the union should engage in politics, but they demanded that the membership decide the brand of politics it wanted after adequate opportunity had been offered for discussion.

The Progressive Group drew up a militant program which it offered to the membership for consideration. This program condemned the policies of the C.P. stooges and asked for a constructive drive to build the union on a sound basis. Among its planks were lower dues to attract more members, a national financial report (to account for the large portion of membership dues which went to the national and district offices), and abolition of the "no strike" clause from the union constitution.

The Progressive Group demanded the right to express these opinions to the membership. To reach the large part of the union membership which never attends meetings, the P.G. issued a number of leaflets on union affairs. The union's official press, it goes almost without saying, was not open to criticism of the policies of the leadership.

After more than a year of such agitation, which the Stalinist caucus could not counteract by a whispering campaign in which they termed the members of the Progressive Group everything from "Red Baiters" to "tools of the administration," they decided to meet the criticism in more characteristic Stalinist style. Meetings were no longer run in an orderly fashion, but degenerated into shouting contests, with one Stalinist outdoing the next in name-calling and vituperation.

The pay-off in one local came when the degenerate leadership had the temerity to try to stage a miniature Moscow Trial against three prominent members of the Progressive Group. These three workers, who had fought for the building of the union from the very beginning of its existence, had served as officials and committee members, were suddenly confronted without notice with nine typewritten pages of charges and told to "confess" that they were enemies of the union. When these members protested against this disorderly and unconstitutional procedure and asked for written copies of the charges and for time to prepare a defense and to secure witnesses, they were answered by the vice-president of the District, a Stalinist named Blumberg who "just happened" to be present, with "You traitors are doing just like the reactionary members of the City Council. You are obstructing justice and preventing progress by hiding behind a cloak of legality."

Such a leadership can have but one result. The awakening of the mind of the civil service worker to the need for solidarity against the wage-cutting tactics of the administration has been indefinitely postponed, and the militancy and spirit of those who had already been won over has been deadened and almost wiped out. Nevertheless, the conditions that will cause these workers to band together for their mutual protection still exist, Stalinist betrayals or not. Decreased budgets will intensify these conditions and again workers will surge toward the union. The really progressive and advanced workers in the union will not have remained idle in the meantime. They will continue their struggle to unite the civil service workers on the basis of the class struggle, with a program calling for rank and file control of the union and the end of remote control by the Kremlin.

—Civil Service Worker.

DON'T FORGET TO RENEW YOUR SUBSCRIPTION TO LABOR POWER.

WORKERS! THIS IS *YOUR* PAPER!

This paper is a fearless champion of the working class and fights its battles as they must be fought. It wars on foes within and without the labor movement. It gives battle to the capitalist enemy on the open field of war; it unmasks his false teachings, his false political economy, his insidious efforts to chloroform labor. But it turns also upon the misleader of labor in the working class ranks. It will tolerate no false prophets, no pernicious principles, humbug economics, least of all will it remain silent when the workers are deceived or sold out either by vacillating or corrupt "labor leaders."

This paper fights for a cause. It demands the emancipation of labor and the inauguration of Socialism. It stops at nothing short of that!

Do you want to learn what is wrong with the country?

Do you wish to understand the manoeuvres of the political parties of capitalism?

Do you wish to know why the lot of labor does not improve?

Do you wish to know why Labor is made the "goat"?

Do you desire to know why strikes are lost?

Do you desire to know how to organize to defeat the capitalist class?

YOU DO? Then read **Labor Power.** Subscribe! Help build it.

SOCIALIST UNION PARTY

Directory of Branches

MINNEAPOLIS
1416 Second Street, South

CHICAGO
Box 1,
34 South Peoria Street

LOS ANGELES
221 South Spring St.

NEW YORK
1301 Boston Road

Send orders and remittances to BUSINESS MANAGER, "LABOR POWER," P. O. Box No. 4, Station T, New York, N. Y.